

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI'S CONFERENCE ROOM

27 JULY 1953, 4:00 P.M.

Present

Mr. Lyman B. Kirkpatrick  
Chairman

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Chief, PM

Mr. John Warner  
Dep. Gen. Coun.

25X1

[REDACTED]  
DD/TR (General)

25X1

[REDACTED]  
DD/TR (Special)

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Ch of Support Staff

25X1

M [REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief, PI

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief, PP

Mr. Desmond Fitzgerald  
Deputy Chief, FE

25X1

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief, SE

25X1

[REDACTED]  
Deputy Chief, EE

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

25X1

**Page Denied**

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Denied

CIA CAREER SERVICE BOARD MEETING

DCI'S CONFERENCE ROOM

27 JULY 1953, 4:00 P.M.

(After hearing from the Chairman of the CIA Career Service Board, Mr. Lyman Kirkpatrick, re the Executive Inventory, the following occurred:)

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you are nominating from outside the office an individual, if you don't know enough about his present job to fill it in, either indicate what his present job is and we can get the details, or else say, "On the basis of my knowledge of this individual, when he is performing such and such a job his capabilities . . ."

25X1 MR. [ ] You wouldn't indicate the qualifications you think he has to fill the job you are suggesting?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: If you know those qualifications firsthand, yes. I would assume that he would be exhibiting them in his present job or in the job that you are appointing from.

25X1 [ ] Do you wish to have them rated?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: In order of priority?

25X1 [ ] My own job, suppose I have three -- just three -- names, or do you wish to have them rated?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I would rate them. That would make the Inventory more valuable if they are rated.

25X1 MR. [ ] And there is no distinction between PP, FI, or PM?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, this is across the board.

25X1 MR. [ ] At the Division level where you are only asked to supply one name, presumably that should go outside of anybody who is presently occupying an Executive Inventory position, correct?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, I don't quite follow, Alan.

25X1 [ ] I was just thinking if the three Divisions in OO did a round robin each nominating the other, it wouldn't serve any purpose.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: No, that wouldn't serve any purpose. You would have

to nominate somebody to succeed yourself.

25X1  Somebody who was outside of this present Inventory  
or . . . ?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes.

MR. BARNES: If the same fellow is nominated for two or three different jobs, does the outfit where he is presently working get the priority, or how do you decide that?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Well, you are not nominating for jobs and putting them on the Executive Inventory. You are just getting a name in the Executive Inventory, and he will not be nominated for a job until there is a job vacancy when the Director will say, "He looks like a good man," and he will say, "Tracy, do you want to yield him to take this other job?" and you may say, "Well, he is too important where he is," and he wouldn't push it then.

MR. BARNES: But the nomination is linked to the job at the time it is made?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: Oh, yes.

MR. BARNES: On the other hand, if you had three people all nominate the same fellow and only one each, there are going to be two people short, and you come back and say . . .

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It shouldn't be limited to just one nomination. If there are two, by all means nominate two, and if there are five, by all means nominate five, and, of course, there may be nobody. I hope that is not true. At the maximum we should have 350 names, and at the minimum we should end up with about 125. Now if you nominate the same man that is all right. From the point of view of the Inventory it would be even more appropriate, and then when the Director looks at the card he can see that here is X who is nominated by five or seven different individuals, and, therefore, he realizes he has a fairly broad reputation across the board as an individual in the executive capacity. You might nominate him. The FI side, PP side, and PM side might all nominate him, and the DD/P might

nominate him.

25X1 MR. [ ] Somebody that is already listed on the Inventory, because he occupies one of these jobs, should he be listed for another job that you think he might be qualified for?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: I see no reason why not.

25X1 MR. [ ] This matter of "Don't go down too far." Obviously if there is a gap of three grades there . . . There are some individuals in the Agency who started at very low grades and are making their way up. They are quite competent, and yet because of the time element they have not reached a grade that would put them into a position to be considered here. Can exceptions be made? How much leeway can we have there?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is one of the reasons we put this six months item in here, Sid, so that if he can qualify in six months to succeed you, why, that is the factor involved. I think we should stick by the six months, and let's not confuse it anymore.

25X1 MR. [ ] I would like to talk about grades. The new [ ] 25X1

25X1 [ ] says that one of the functions of the Career Service is to implement a just promotion plan. I presume that same wording appears elsewhere in the Agency. Where does the just promotion policy come from?

MR. KIRKPATRICK: That is a very good question, Hugh, because right at the moment we have got under consideration whether we shouldn't lay down an across the Agency promotion policy. On the one hand there is reluctance to go back to the present 1950 days when there was an absolutely standard policy for promotion . . . you will be in grade so long to go from such a grade to such a grade . . . and, on the other hand, we have the fact that probably every office has a slightly different promotion policy today from every other office, and that is one of the things which the Director is going to decide on before he takes his leave this summer. He wants to get that one hammered down because that question has been asked by darn near every Career Service Board.

25X1

MR. [ ] I would like to say that I think that this Career Service system is finally really getting its teeth on to something. It has long needed to have some teeth into this.

MR. KIRKPATRICK: It seems we still have a long way to go. In the first place, I think you all recognize we can't exist with 23 Career Service Boards, and the personnel involved in servicing 23 Career Service Boards is out of the question.

I am just completing a survey of the Personnel Office, as I think most of you know. Everybody in the Personnel Office knows it, so it is not highly classified. That should be in the Director's hands within the matter of a few weeks, and there is a rather startling figure in that, which I am not at liberty to disclose, as to how many people we have doing personnel work, but we simply have got to draw our lines closer together to get this thing centralized and systematized and stop handling individuals on a mass production basis. I think we can do that. Now this is giving you a slight preview of what I think the things are we must do.

We have two other things rolling. We have a Legislative Task Force now at work to prepare the material to submit to the General Counsel's Office for the preparation of legislation to give CIA what it needs for a Career Service. The Director is following that fairly closely, and we think at the next session of Congress we will be ready to put it through. We have another Task Force at work preparing a statement of What a Career Service in the Central Intelligence Agency Means to You, which will come right down to the brass tacks and talk about tenure, dependent benefits, illness, and all of the factors which are not clear issues today, indicating where we don't have what we want and how we are going after other things we need.

And then another factor is at the Director's request I am convening a panel of women to talk about careers for women in the Agency because those of you who sat in at the last Orientation Course know the Director got about five questions on the subject of whether there is professional discrimination against women in the Agency. Can a woman get ahead just as fast?

Are fewer women hired than men? All that sort of thing. Now those are the things we have got rolling, and I hope by the time snow flies we can really get this thing shaken down and moving the way it should. I think it is particularly important for foreign Division Chiefs and Deputy Chiefs that we get it straightened down so we can give the people in the field a real statement about what is going on before too long because Frank tells me everybody asks about it, and all they have gotten is one rather dry bureaucratic regulation on the subject, with due apologies to those who wrote it.

... The meeting then adjourned at 1635 ...